



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,116	12/10/2003	Toshihiko Kaku	4243-0106P	4657
2292 7590 03/09/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER CHU, RANDOLPH I				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2624				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/09/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/731,116

**Applicant(s)**

KAKU, TOSHIHIKO

**Examiner**

RANDOLPH CHU

**Art Unit**

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI.08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/16/2008

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,7,8, 14-16 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 2004/0041924) in view of Maruoka (US Patent 6,765,686).

With respect to claim 1, White et al. teach White et al. teaches, an image acquisition section that acquires image data representing an image (Fig 1, ref no. 102);

a correction section that detects a particular eye-related defect in the image represented by the image data acquired by the image acquisition section and corrects the detected defect (Fig 1; ref no. 108, 110 and 113); and

an image display section that displays the number of positions at which the defect has been detected by the correction section, together with the image including the positions (Fig 1; ref no. 114, para. [0058] and [0068]).

White et al. does not teach expressly that the correction section detects the defect in the image and prioritizes the positions at which the defect has been detected based on a predetermined criteria and the predetermined criteria includes the eye-related defect being closer to a center of the image.

Maruoka teaches the correction section detects the defect in the image and prioritizes the positions at which the defect has been detected based on a predetermined criteria and the predetermined criteria includes the eye-related defect being closer to a center of the image (Fig. 22 and 23; col. 22 lines 31-54).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to search for red-eye starting from center of the image in the apparatus of White et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that defect correction can be quicker with shortening searching time for correction objects.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maruoka with White et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

With respect to claim 6, White et al. teaches a confirmation section that receives an operation for confirming the positions in the image displayed by the image display section, at which the defect has been detected by the correction section (Fig. 6 Accept button) , wherein the image display section, when displaying the number of the positions, displays the number of the positions minus the number of positions confirmed by the confirmation section (number of eye color defect) (para[066]-[069]).

With respect to claim 7, White et al. teaches that correction section detects red-eye portions in the image and corrects the detected red-eye portions (Fig 1; ref no. 108, 110 and 113).

With respect to claim 8, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 14, please refer to rejection for claim 7.

With respect to claim 15, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 16, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 22, Maruoka teaches the predetermined criteria includes an area of the eye-related defect (col. 22 lines 10-54).

3. Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 2004/0041924) in view of Maruoka (US Patent 6,765,686) and in further view of Karasawa (US 2002/0051225).

White et al. and Maruoka teach all the limitations of claim 1 as applied above from which claim 4 respectively depend.

White et al. and Maruoka does not teach expressly that displays in preference a position to which a higher priority.

Karasawa teaches displays in preference a position to which a higher priority (para [0022]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to display preference a position to which a higher priority in the apparatus of White et al. and Maruoka

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that defect with higher priority can display and correct with higher priority than other defects.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Karasawa with and White et al. and Maruoka to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

With respect to claim 9, please refer to rejection for claim 2.

4. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 2004/0041924) in view of Maruoka (US Patent 6,765,686) and in further view of Robertson et al. (US patent 5,245,421).

White et al. and Maruoka teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as applied above from which claim 3 respectively depend.

White et al. and Maruoka does not teach expressly that display section, when displaying the image, displays a list of the positions.

Robertson et al. teaches that display section, when displaying the image, displays a list of the positions (co. 7 line 63 –col. 8 line 5).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to display list of the positions for the defect in image in the apparatus of White et al. and Maruoka.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that user can easily identifies all the defect with list of the position.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Robertson et al. with White et al. and Maruoka to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

With respect to claim 10, please refer to rejection for claim 3.

5. Claims 4, 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 2004/0041924) in view of Maruoka (US Patent 6,765,686) and in further view of Sato et al. (US Patent 6,977,676).

White et al. and Maruoka teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as applied above from which claims 4 and 5 respectively depend.

White et al. and Maruoka does not teach expressly that zooms at least one of the positions and displaying the image, and displays a normal image in which none of the positions is zoomed and a zoomed image in which at least one of the positions is zoomed.

Sato et al. teaches zooms at least one of the positions and displaying the image, and displays a normal image in which none of the positions is zoomed and a zoomed image in which at least one of the positions is zoomed (Fig 2 and 9; col. 2 line 54 – col. 2 line 21).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to zoom the position of the defect and display it in the apparatus of White

et al. and Maruoka The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that user can easily identify the defect in detail with zoomed image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sato et al. with White et al. and Maruoka to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4 and 5.

With respect to claim 11, please refer to rejection for claim 4.

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 2004/0041924) in view of Maruoka (US Patent 6,765,686) and in further view of Fushiki et al. (US Patent 7,065,249).

White et al. and Maruoka teaches all the limitations of claim 8 as applied above from which claim 12 respectively depend.

White et al. and Maruoka does not teach expressly that a correction cancellation section that restores the defect corrected by the correction section, in the corrected image displayed by the image display section, to the original condition held before the defect is corrected by the correction section.

Fushiki et al. teaches a correction cancellation section that restores the defect corrected by the correction section, in the corrected image displayed by the image display section, to the original condition held before the defect is corrected by the correction section (col. 10 lines 36-52).



At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to cancel the defect correction in the apparatus of White et al. and Maruoka.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that it will allow user to reverse changes to the image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Fushiki et al. with White et al. and Maruoka to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 2004/0041924) in view of Maruoka (US Patent 6,765,686) and in further view of Murray et al. (US 2002/0109854).

White et al. and Maruoka teaches all the limitations of claim 8 as applied above from which claim 13 respectively depend.

White et al. and Maruoka does not teach expressly that image display section, when displaying the corrected image, emphasizes the defect corrected by the correction section.

Murray et al. teaches that image display section, when displaying the corrected image, emphasizes the defect corrected by the correction section (para. [0035]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to emphasizes the defect corrected by the correction section in the apparatus of White et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that image improvement can be highlighted so as to be easily detectable by an operator.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Murray et al. with White et al. and Maruoka to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

### ***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **RANDOLPH CHU** whose telephone number is

(571)270-1145. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 571-272-77787778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RIC/

/Matthew C Bella/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624